


<b>Search Notes</b>  	<b>Application/Control No.</b>  09820502	<b>Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination</b>  ULLMANN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>  KAREN C TANG	<b>Art Unit</b>  2451

SEARCHED			
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner
370	229, 235, 230	10/9/08	/KT/
709	227, 224,225,226	10/9/08	/KT/

SEARCH NOTES		
Search Notes	Date	Examiner
East Seach Notes on Class 370/229, 235, 230 and Class 709/224,225,226	10/9/08	/KT/
East Search Notes in Key Word Search in Class 370/229,235,230 and Class 709/224/225/226	10/9/08	/KT/
Inventor Search	10/9/08	/KT/
Double Patenting Search	10/9/08	/KT/
ACM Search	10/9/08	/KT/
IEEE Search	10/9/08	/KT/
Google Search	10/9/08	/KT/
East Update Search	2/25/09	/KT/
SPoke to John Follansbee regarding with 101 and concluded that the method claims doesn't have 101 because the "packet snooper" cannot possibly be done by human, and the apparatus has 101 due to claim 31, claim 31 is 101 due to the specification 57	2/25/09	/KT/
Update IEEE Search	2/25/09	/KT/
Update ACM Search	2/25/09	/KT/
Update Google Search	2/25/09	/KT/

INTERFERENCE SEARCH			
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner

--	--